Docket Number: 10012879-1

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 6,-10, 14, 19-22, and 25-26 remain pending in the present patent application. Claims 1, 6, 7, 14, 19, 20, 25, and 26 have been amended, and claims 2-5, 11-13, 15-18, 23-24, and 27 have been canceled herein. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

As an initial matter, the specification has been amended herein to correct typographical errors noted in the Title and the Detailed Description.

Next, in item 4 of the Office Action, claims 7, 11, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being definite for failing to particular point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claims 7 and 20 have been rejected as the element of "the tag" lacked antecedent basis. Also, claim 11 includes further antecedent basis issues. Claims 7 and 20 have been amended to address the issues noted. Also, claim 11 is cancelled herein, thereby rendering this grounds of rejection moot with respect to such claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under §112 of claims 7, 11, and 20 be withdrawn.

Next, in item 6 of the Office Action, claims 1-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,324,566 issued to Himmel et al. (hereafter "Himmel") and U.S. Patent 6,032,162 issued to Burke (hereafter "Burke"). A prima facie case of obviousness is established only when the prior art teaches or suggests all of the elements of the claims. MPEP §2143.03, In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 U.S.P.Q2d 1955, 1958 (Fed. Cir. 1993). For the reasons that follow, Applicant asserts that the cited combination of references fails to show and suggest each of the elements of the claims that remain pending. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1, 6-10, 14, 19-22, and 25-26 be withdrawn.

To begin, claim 1 has been amended herein to provide for the following:

Docket Number: 10012879-1

indicator, wher in the accessing further comprises:
downloading a web page from the remote
computer system; and

parsing a source code of the web page to extract the locators and a plurality of bookmark indicators from the source code, each of the bookmark indicators being associated with a respective one of the group-associated bookmarks; and displaying the bookmark indicators.

In this respect, claim 1 above essentially incorporates the subject matter of claims 3, 4, and 5 canceled herein that previously depended from claim 1. With respect to such subject matter, the Office Action states:

"As per claims 3, 16 same as claim arguments above and Himmel teaches: Wherein the accessing includes downloading a web page from the remote computer at col. 5, lines 1-3.

As per claims 4, 17 same as claim arguments above and Himmel teaches: Wherein the accessing further includes parsing source of the web page to extract the locaters at col. 4, lines 65-67 and col. 10, lines 15-54, 31-39 (Himmel teaches downloading a bookmark set (sets of URL's and making these bookmarks available to the user. The example describes providing a user access to the bookmark set on cancer and access to the bookmarks contained within the set. The bookmarks are linked to the web pages containing articles on the topic of cancer. These bookmarks have text (bookmark indicators) describing each article).

As per claims 5, 18 same as claim arguments above and Himmel teaches: Wherein the parsing includes extracting the bookmark indicators from the source code at col. 4, lines 65-67 and col. 10, lines 15-20, 31-39. (Himmel teaches downloading a bookmark set and making these bookmarks available to the user. The example describes providing user access to the bookmark set on cancer and access to the bookmarks contained within the set. The bookmarks are linked to the web pages containing articles on the topic of cancer. These bookmarks have text (bookmark indicators) describing the each article.) (Office Action, pages 4-5)."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, at column 4, lines 64-67, Himmel states:

"In the referenced application, a bookmark set is associated with a web server and/or web page and downloaded to a client browser by either a push or pull operation."

In addition, at column 10, lines 15-42, Himmel states:

"In the preferred embodiment, a bookmark set is detected by the browser by parsing the HTML returned by the server for a unique tag. That is, the bookmark set is specified through a uniqu

Docket Number: 10012879-1

MIME type, e.g., x-bookmark-set, that is added, to the browser's bookmark options. For example, the HTML for adding a bookmark set for a computer manufacturer would look like:

Content-type: text/Bookmark set <line feed> <line feed> <HTML> <HEAD> <TITLE> GM Bookmark sets </TITLE> </HEAD> </HTML>

While many industries that can benefit from aggregating information as prepackaged URLs i.e. as bookmark sets, which are retrievable based on predetermined search criteria, a few examples are given below.

For example, a research institution or company can benefit from pre-packaging book information by "topics" or "authors" on sets of URLs, i.e. bookmark sets, that can direct the user to the electronic review of the selected subject. A student performing research on Shakespeare should be able to search for a bookmark set on Shakespeare, probably one of many, and download the selected bookmark set to his/her computer to review a selected set of "most important" URLs related to Shakespeare. As mentioned above, using today's available search technology, independently repeating this research takes a considerable amount of time to collect meaningful URLs.

Another application of the invention would be for a hospital or doctor to advertise their services. Bookmark sets on "cancer", "breast cancer". "heart disease" and so forth would include bookmarks to web pages containing articles on such topics. In addition, these bookmark sets would contain bookmarks to a hospital or doctor offering services for these conditions. The better the set of articles, the more likely a patient would be inclined to contact the doctor or hospital included in the bookmark set. Thus, there exists a potential market for bookmark set providers, either to provide a bookmark set to the hospital on a one time fee basis or as an ongoing fee as an advertisement."

As described above, Himmel simply describes the concept of providing predetermined or preconfigured bookmark sets that are stored in the server and transmitted down to the client device upon request. In contrast, the present invention as claimed in claim 1 provides for accessing the locators for the group associated bookmarks by downloading a web page from a remote computer system and parsing the source code of the web page to extract the locators and the bookmark indicators from the source code itself. In this respect, the parsing function necessarily involves scanning through the source code to find the anchor tags as claimed in the present invention.

Applicant asserts that Himmel fails to show or suggest the concept of generating bookmarks as described. Rather, Himmel simply provides for the concept of generating predefined "bookmark sets" that are then downloaded to the

Docket Number: 10012879-1

user based upon a user request. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that Himmel fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claim 1 as amended. Therefore, Applicant requests the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

In addition, claims 6-10 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 6-10 be withdrawn for the same reasons as described above with respect to claim 1. Also, independent claims 14, 25, and 26 include elements similar in scope with those of claim 1 as amended above. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 14, 25, and 28 be withdrawn for the same reasons described above with respect to claim 1. In addition, Applicant asserts that claims 19-22 are in condition for allowance as depending from claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 19-22 be withdrawn as depending from claim 14.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. D'Aurelio

Reg. No. 40,977

D'Aurelio & Mathews, LLC 96 Church Street Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022 Phone: (440) 729-7450

Fax: (440) 729-7465